



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*Amj*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/310,800      05/12/99      CHAUG      Y      96-017-TAX

TM11/1017

WAYNE P BAILEY  
STORAGE TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION  
ONE STORAGE TEK DRIVE  
MS 4309  
LOUISVILLE CO 80028-4309

EXAMINER

TUPPER, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2652

DATE MAILED:

10/17/00

*16*

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

*6*

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**09/310,800**

Applicant(s)  
**Chuang**

Examiner  
**R. S. Tupper**

Group Art Unit  
**2754**



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Sep 11, 2000

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire THREE month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-6, 8-14, and 16-30 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) 11-14, 16-18, and 30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-6, 8-10, and 19-29 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2754

1. Newly submitted claim 30 is directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

This is directed to the method of using a head structure. This method is usable with other head structures, and the head structure is usable with other methods.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits.

Accordingly, claim 30 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

2. Claims 11-14 and 16-18 remain withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 5.

Art Unit: 2754

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, and 19-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by TSUTAKI et al (5,022,140).

Note figures 3A-3F. TSUTAKI et al shows a multiple recording/reproducing head block structure (before it is cut into single heads) that has gluing vias between the individual heads.

Concerning claims 5, 10, 19, and 29, as the claims are directed to a "magnetic head assembly", per se, the method limitation appearing in these claims have only been accorded weight to the extent that they affect the structure of the completed magnetic head. Note that "[d]etermination of patentability in 'product-by-process' claims is based on product itself, even though

Art Unit: 2754

such claims are limited and defined by process, and thus product in such claim is unpatentable if it is the same as, or obvious form, product of prior art, even if prior product was made by a different process", *In re Thorpe, et al.*, 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC 1985). Furthermore, note that a "[p]roduct-by-process claim, although reciting subject matter of claim in terms of how it is made, is still product claim; it is patentability of product claimed and not recited process steps that must be established, in spite of fact that claim may recite only process limitations", *In re Hirao and Sato*, 190 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1976).

5. Applicant's arguments filed 9/11/00 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that TSUTAKI et al does not teach an multi-recording assembly that is operable for either reading or writing. This is in error. The multiple head block shown in figures 3A-3F is so operable.

Applicant further asserts that claim 19 is allowable. This is in error. The restriction requirement still stands.

Art Unit: 2754

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to R. Tupper whose telephone number is (703) 308-1601.

Application/Control Number: 09/310800

Page 6

Art Unit: 2754

*R.S. Tupper*

ROBERT S. TUPPER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 2500

October 16, 2000